(ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.)

ಅವಗಾಹನೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, enquiry ಮಾಡಿದೆವು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸೋಷಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯ ಸುಳ್ಳು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸುಳ್ಳು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು unparliamentary.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದುದು. ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಏಕೀಕರಣವಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಸಮೂಹ ಸೇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಧ್ವಜವನ್ನು ಗೌರವಿಸುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟುದು ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As a matter of clarification, I never made any imputation or imputed any motive against anybody.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಇದು investigation ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಾಯಿನಾಡು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದಹಾಗೂ, ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದಹಾಗೂ, ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು resolution ಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಎಂತಹವರು ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Srirangapatna).—I rise to a point of order. How is the Hon'ble Member in order in trying to reply to a statement made by the Hon'ble Minister ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may say how it is admissible. In view of the facts stated by the Hon'ble Minister, I wanted to know whether he wanted to say anything. That is all.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದಮೇಲೆ ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಪರಿಚಯ ಗೊತ್ತಾದಮೇಲೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಯಾರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತನಿಖೆಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ specific ಆಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಅಗೌರವ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೆಂದು ಘಂಟಾಘೋಷವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In view of the statement made by the Hon'ble Minister, no useful purpose will be served by the Hon'ble House in discussing it. I therefore disallow the adjournment motion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ನಾರಾಯಣರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—(ಬಾಗೇಪಲ್ಲಿ-ಗುಡಿಬಂಡೆ) ನಾನು ಒಂದು adjournment motion ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was received in the office very late. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾಳೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ.

Sri R. K. PRASAD (Bangarpet).—I request you to give the ruling before the Opposition Leader starts making his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Imam will speak as Sri Mohamed Imam and not as Opposition Leader. Before I decide on that issue I want to hear him and then decide it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I am speaking as the Leader of the Opposition. Regarding that, I wanted to say myself. Since the Opposition has become the nightmare of Sri Prasad, I am glad he has raised that question. And I am glad you are going to set up a precedent. It is better that we discuss that matter. You may give me an opportunity and also to such of those who are anxious to take part in discussion on this important matter, and then you may give a decision. So you can fix a time for that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Shall we discuss it tomorrow?

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—Immediately after the question hour tomorrow, it is better that it is discussed.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Yes.

DISCUSSION ON STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION REPORT

Motion to consider (*contd.*)

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Yesterday, I spoke on the issue of Bellary question and I have given, I believe, cogent reasons as to why Bellary should not be separated from the State of Mysore. Sir, I must bring to the attention of the Government and this House one disquieting news we have received in connection with Bellary. We read in the Papers that the people of Bellary and round about have started Satyagraha and about 51 persons have been arrested and the Satyagraha is going to be continued indefinitely. Of course, this movement on their part shows their depth of feeling and their desire to be with Mysore and their desperate intention to achieve the object of retaining these taluks in Mysore. I am anxious that Government s ould

take some prompt steps either to bring to the notice of the Central Government or to give them some assurance that they will do everything in their power to achieve the common object. Yesterday. Sir, I appealed that it is desirable on their part to suspend the movement till a definite decision is taken by the Central Government. The situation may become worse, and I request the Government to take prompt action and act quickly in this matter. I want to bring to the notice of this House one or two other aspects. Yesterday, Sir, I mentioned that since Raichur is going to form part of Mysore, more than half of Tungabhadra Project will come to Mysore and from the point of view of administrative convenience, it is desirable not to disturb the existing state of affairs but to retain Bellary and other two Taluks in Mysore.

Bellary is between Raichur and Chitaldrug Districts and if Bellary is to go away to Andhra, then Raichur District becomes an enclave in Andhra. Communication and approach will become very difficult. I want to correct one error made in the report today in the 'Deccan Herald'; yesterday I referred to the premature statements of Sri Gopala Reddy and other statements which he made ultimately proved to be correct, and I am rather inclined to presume that he was more in the confidence of S.R.C. than our own Chief Minister. It is printed there as 'Government'. I would appeal to the concerned Paper to correct it as the S.R.C. instead of Government.

Sir, I now come to the main question of the formation of Karnataka which has been engaging the attention of the entire State and every individual in the State. This is not the first time that we have taken part in the debate for the formation of Karnataka. About five months ago, the report of the Fact Finding Committee was before this House and discussed threadbare. A number of Hon'ble Members of this House took part. Nearly forty out of sixty members that took part in the debate supported the motion, supported and approved the formation of Karnataka. At that time, the Chief Minister or anybody else on behalf of the Government did not make any statement. But the House was given to understand that all the proceedings and the speeches of the Hon'ble Members of this House would be sent either to the Fazl Ali Commission or to the Central Government. The Government assured that the proceedings would be sent to the Fazl Ali Commission. I do not know what action has been taken by the Government. At the end of the discussions, the Chief Minister went out on a tour rather unceremoniously, while other Ministers went out to play chess! It became a farce. However, the proceedings are there and the opinions of the members are there. It is an admitted fact that in the course of the discussions, most of the members who took part have advocated the formation of Karnataka. If the proceedings have not been sent already I request the Government they may even now be sent to the Central Government. Some of us have made an exhaustive survey. We have made lengthy speeches realising that the discussion was very important. Even now, I have to restate many of the points that were urged then.

Sir, the publication of the S.R.C. Report has been engaging the attention not only of the Mysoreans, but also of the people of other States in India. Every State is busy in carving out its own State, expanding its boundaries and re-modelling it. They have taken advantage of the occasion and are busy in expanding their States as much as possible and absorb all persons that speak their own language and have common culture. They do not want to give up an inch of territory which they think legitimately belongs to them. For example, take Andhra. At present, the State of Andhra comprises 62,000 square miles with a population of 20 millions. But they think that their State is small, and are interested in expanding it and want the formation of Visala Andhra, including Hyderabad or Telengana. And they have laid claim, not satisfied with what they have got, to Bellary and other taluks. Take Maharastra. Though the Maharastra in Bombay is big, they want to include Vidarbha, and want to

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

form Akhila Maharastra with Bombay so that all Maharastrians may live together under one State. Take, Sir, the State of U.P. It has a population of seventy millions or seven crores having a huge area. I don't know the exact area. It is twice as big as Bihar. There is a suggestion to divide that State into two so that their domination at the Centre may be minimised. But they are not agreeable. They want to have a big area. They are not willing to reduce. Similarly, Keralas are interested in expanding their area and include parts of Madras and Cochin. The same with Panjab and Himachal Pradesh. It is unfortunate that a section in Mysore do not seem to be anxious to expand their State. They have become Sanyasies, with no worldly ambition. Their wants are so limited that they want to live like tiny tadpoles in a tin pot. I mean a section of the people. This disease is confined to the State of Mysore as against other States whose outlook and whose policy are quite different. They believe in the advantage of a tiny State. This is a surprising attitude—this attitude of some section of the people of Mysore State. This is an ailment, and shall I say these people are suffering from inferiority complex? So, Sir, this disease or ailment requires a thorough and correct diagnosis and an effective remedy.

I am not going into the details regarding the history of the movement of Karnataka. I do not want to dilate in detail on the historical background. Suffice it for me to say that the people living in different parts of dismembered Karnataka, desire to live together as they did during the time of Vijayanagar kings. Subsequently, as was pointed out by the Chief Minister yesterday, even during the Adil Shah's dynasty, all people speaking Kannada and enjoying a common culture lived under one administration. Even during the time of Tippu Sultan, whose country, whose principality extended from Cauvery to Godavari, all those people were living together.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City—North).—From Cochin.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—From Cochin to Godavari they were living under one king, under one culture. After 1799, owing to historical accidents, this glorious Karnataka was cut to pieces. It was dismembered and thrown into other neighbouring States. After Tippu Sultan was defeated by the British through the machinations of the Hyderabad Nawab and the Mahrattas—I may say that Tippu Sultan lost his life because his one aim was that the Britishers should not step into India. His aim was to drive them out of Mysore. In that attempt he lost his life. The Nizam got the Circars. Mahrattas got North Karnataka and Madras people got South Canara. That was the fate of Kannadigas. All of them were thrown to the mercy of the neighbouring States. Since then, they have been living as discarded people in the tail ends of the surrounding States, feeling that they have no home to live in. They are all Indian citizens. Still one must have a home. I may live in Bangalore. Still I must have a home to dwell in. We may be nationalists. But I must have a home wherein I may have to stay and call it home. That is their position. For 150 years they had no home of their own. They were separated from their kith and kin. They were separated from all those people with whom they had dealings. As I said, the people of North Karnataka and the people of Mysore lived together. But now the contact between these two sections of people is very little, so much so that they have become strangers to Mysore people and we have become strangers to North Karnataka people. In the last debate, a good many of my friends felt suspicious of these people. They said that they are not sure of the future, as they did not know those people intimately. It was because they rarely came into contact with them. If one mixes with them he will come to know what fine fellows they are. I want you not to entertain this suspicion.

Sir, the history of the movement for a united Karnataka, I would roughly divide into four parts.

2 P.M.

The first part of their struggle comprises events that took place roughly since 1905 till the attainment of Independence, *i.e.*, till October 1947. I call this a period of plain living and high thinking. The second period,—I call it a period of power and pomp—commences from October 1947 till the appointment of Fazl Ali Commission. The third period comprises events from the time of the appointment of Fazl Ali Commission till the publication of the S.R.C. Report. The fourth period may be called as a post-publication period.

Sir, the first period I stated as a period of plain living and high thinking. That was at a time when people were guided by very high ideals and noble sentiments. That was a time when the people—not only the people of Mysore but also the people of Karnataka and the people living round about,—thought that it was their duty to share each others joys and sorrows and took part in the national struggle. The Karnataka Movement took a deep root during this period. Sir, many famous names are associated with the movement of Karnataka; many famous organisations including the Congress Organisation have fostered, nourished and nurtured this movement. Lokamanya Balagangadhara Tilak, Sardar Patel, Gokhale and finally Mahatma Gandhi have all blessed this movement; they have encouraged this movement and they have encouraged the people to launch this movement and they had held out promises to those people that their ambitions and their cherished desire would be realised as soon as Independence was achieved. In the year 1920 when the Congress Session was held at Nagpur, nearly 800 delegates from various parts of Karnataka attended that session. The Nagpur Session passed a resolution wherein they had clearly recognised the justification for claiming linguistic provinces. The same resolution was reiterated in the Belagaum Congress Session. In Bombay and in other places where the Congress Session were held, on the linguistic question, the problem had been favourably viewed. Every Congress Session has advocated the cause of formation of Karnataka Province.

Sir, coming to the part played by the Mysore Congress Organisation, though I am repeating it, but still I feel it my duty to draw the attention of this House to some of the salient features that took place before. As I said, the Mysore Congress, the leaders of the Mysore Congress Organisation and of the K.P.C.C. were all comrades in the struggle for the formation of Karnataka. There was mutual contact and help was extended to each other when occasion arose. In the year 1946 the people of North Karnataka during a convention at Davangere, thinking that their cause would be delayed if they claimed Mysore also, stated that they would form a Karnataka of their own. It was then Sri K. Hanumanthaiya (and Sri H. C. Dasappa, I hope he might be holding the same views now) both of them vehemently opposed the formation of Karnataka without Mysore State. They stated that the formation of Karnataka without Mysore is unimaginable. 'You must wait till we join with you'. I am sure, most of the Congress Leaders who are present here today, participated in that convention. If I remember correctly, Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao was there, Sri Huchmasthy Gowda was there. (Sri Huchmasthy Gowda: I was not present there). Anyway you were in the Congress Organisation at that time.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—In what capacity did they speak? Whether as Congress President or as Congress Members?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—One need not be a Congress President. They stated that without Mysore you cannot from a Karnataka. That was the stand taken by them. That opinion was endorsed and voiced by all other Congressmen. I am sure Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao must have also subscribed to that view.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—No, Sir. I did not subscrible to that view.

Sri. J. MOHAMED IMAM.—But he did not differ and continued in the organisation. But anyway the Mysore Congress prevented the formation of one Karnataka, when the people of Bombay Karnataka proposed it in 1946.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Your argument is not based on facts.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Anyhow, when they wanted to form one Karnataka without Mysore, our Mysore Leaders including Sri Hanumanthaiya did not favour that issue. Sri Hanumanthaiya has admitted this.

If Mysore leaders had allowed them then alone to form a separate Karnataka, perhaps, it would have been an accomplished fact. But after having given them an assurance that one united Karnataka will be formed with Mysore, does it look fair on our part to let them down at this time? Where are those Mysore people and leaders who were guided by the noble sentiments at that time? Are they present here today? I am asking Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao himself. Sri Kadidal Manjappa was also a Congress member at that time. They were all guided by high national sentiments; they were all guided by national ideals; they were all guided by a desire to function unitedly. Where is Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao of those days? Is he here today? No, I find his shadow and not his substance. I am asking the other Congressmen also: what became of their noble sentiments, their laudable ideals and their promises? The unfortunate thing is that the three Ministers have taken a hostile attitude which has become a big handicap for the formation of Karnataka, and which stand has brought disgrace to the State of Mysore. Was not Sri Manjappa a member of the Congress at that time? I do not know about Sri Channiah. He went to Delhi as the nominee of Sir Ramaswamy Mudaliar's Government and returned as the nominee of Sri Hanumanthaiya. That is a different matter. How unfair it is for a man, being in power, wielding influence, to take part in such an agitation! They should have guided others properly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They have got individual liberty.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—They should have exercised their individual liberty after resigning from the Cabinet. I raised this question at the last session. I stated that the Ministers are expected to administer the country and not to agitate. That has pained me.

Sir, a friend of mine from the Upper House came to me for my advice. He told me that Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao told him that by forming a Karnataka, the existing constituencies become very big and unwieldy and we have to face very heavy electorates. I told him that constituencies increase in number and would not become unwieldy. It is such a kind of propaganda carried on by the Minister.

Sri. A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I am sorry, I have never carried on any propaganda. It is not correct. I will answer his point later on.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Similarly, Sri T. Channiah had gone to Delhi to carry on propaganda. That is why I stated that they should not administer the State. These Ministers in a body have banded themselves together into an unholy alliance to influence members and to win them over. They spread a sort of propaganda, and above all remain with the Government and try to sabotage the policy of the Government.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—What was the policy of Government?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The policy of Government, by implication, was for the formation of Karnataka. I am coming to that point later on. I am going to prove it.

There was the Birur convention of Congress, where they reiterated the formation of Karnataka, and advocated that the formation of Karnataka is a very desirable thing and appointed a Committee consisting of six members of whom the present President of the Congress (Sri Sowcar Channaiah) Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao, Sri Bandi Gowda, Sri T. S. Siddalingiah and others were the members This Committee toured not only the State of Mysore but also the entire length and breadth of India and met the High Command and the members of the

Working Committee and after having collected all the relevant data, they consulted Sardar Patel and other leaders of the High Command, and they formulated a report advocating the formation of Karnataka. I will just read from their report which is signed by three members, *viz.*, Sri T. S. Siddalingiah and others. They have unequivocally stated in their report that it is desirable to form the State of Karnataka.

Again there was another convention under the Presidentship of Sri K.C. Reddy at Bangalore, wherein the old stand was reiterated. Sir, did not all these gentlemen subscribe to that view? Did not they approve of the action taken by that Committee? Did they at any time protest against the formation of Karnataka? I want to tell it to this House that the Mysore Congress and all the members of the Congress and those affiliated to the Congress had blessed this movement of Karnataka. They actively co-operated with them.

A memorandum has been presented to the members wherein the formation of a United Karnataka has been urged. This has been taken note of by the S.R.C. I am perfectly justified in quoting these passages. If there is anything wrong let others contradict it.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Has the S.R.C. Report referred to this memorandum?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—They might have referred to this memorandum.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Channagiri).—In the Appendix to the S.R.C Report, they have appended a list of documents examined by them.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I am prefectly right in referring to this memorandum, because it is an authorised and uncontradicted document.

Sir, these are the events that happened during the first period when the people were guided by highest noble sentiments and laudable objects and having only the good of the State and the country at heart. Then, Sir, in 1947, the Independence dawned. The Mysore Congress was invested with the power of administration; there was great jubilation all over the State, because the people of Mysore got the opportunity of administering the State. They got power, they got pomp and prestige, whereas the people living outside Mysore did not achieve their cherished desire. They had no cause to rejoice because their position did not alter much. They were living before under British domination. Even after the dawn of Independence, they had to live in States where perhaps they were dominated by other races or other people. What is more, since they had to live in the tail-ends of the States of Madras, Bombay and Hyderabad, their position and their plight did not improve in any way, So their struggle for United Karnataka increased. I think their object was intensified and during their struggle they expected all co-operation and help from the people of Mysore. But power brings about many changes. First of all, it makes one forget his old friends. Power and pomp make one to deviate from the principle to which he is wedded. And what is more, power and pomp make one very lethargic to share them along with others and what is more, to reap the benefits of that power, it is possible that some evils may breed, such as communal consideration and selfishness and to take as much as possible as a result of their being invested with this power.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ತಿಮ್ಮಪ್ಪಗೌಡ (ಅರಕಲಗೂಡು).—ತಾವು ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I may be here or I may not be here in the next Assembly. The formation of Karnataka is the only remedy and solution, taking the present conditions and situation into consideration. I am going to prove it. The people in power in the State of Mysore, forgot their old comrades and became a bit indifferent. They did not extend active co-operation. When this question was brought in before the Constituent Assembly, the resolution there was that portions in the neighbouring Provinces may be included in the State of Mysore. Again there was a lull. In 1949 I myself brought a resolution

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

requesting the Government to appoint a Committee to investigate the advantages and disadvantages of the formation of United Karnataka and I have said thereon that I am not against the formation of Karnataka. I urged, them to dispel the doubts of many to appoint a Committee. But Sri K. Chengalaraya Reddyat that time said "We are wedded to Karnataka, we are wedded to include others who are outside and who speak a similar language" and asked us to wait till the time comes, but nothing was heard ofi t again. I will give another instance. There was a Conference held at Davangere, called Ekikarana Conference. It was presided over by Sri Karanth. Many members of the Congress Organisation were asked not to attend that Conference. This period, Sri K. C. Reddy's period, was the period of indifference. Then Sri K. Hanumanthaiya came into power and along with him his colleagues. I must admit in fairness to him, after he came into power, there was more activity regarding Karnataka and he has made some three or four outspoken statements which heartened the people of Karnataka a good deal. He said at Nanal Nagar.—I don't know the exact words—that a United Karnataka Province must be formed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He has already stated what he has said.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Again, second time when he went to Mangalore—I am sure when he went there he was followed by some of the Hon'ble Members including Sri Devaraj Urs and others—when he went there he categorically said that Karnataka should be formed and if Sri Jawaharlal Nehru makes up his mind, it can be formed in one day. It was cheered by all his adherents at that time. Again when the question of Bellary came in, its inclusion was hailed unanimously and everybody said that this is the first step and the foundation for the formation of Karnataka. When the Chief Minister was in North Karnataka, he made a series of statements advocating Karnataka. He was the leader of the Congress party, he was the leader of the Legislature Congress Party. He was accompanied by many members. Did any of them at the time protest against his statement? I am speaking on the principle of democracy. He is the Congress Party leader and when he makes a statement in his official capacity, then it is presumed that he speaks for the entire party.

Sri G. A. THIMMAPPA GOWDA.—Don't you know that so many have protested even in the Assembly? You don't know all that?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—When he made those statements at Mangalore and in North Karnataka, nobody protested. In fact, when he was elected as leader of the Congress Party......

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ನಾಗಯ್ಯರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಗೌರಿಬಿದನೂರು).—ಇವರು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ವಿಚಾರ ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವನಂಜೇಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I am not afraid of it. I respect their views. Let them respect mine. I am saying what has come to my knowledge. The Chief Minister has won the vote of confidence from his party. His policies and statements have all been approved by the members of his party.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Not on this issue.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—When he has won the vote of confidence of the Congress Party in the Legislature, he enjoys the full confidence of this House. That is in accordance with democratic principle. Now I shall refer briefly—I do not want to enter into details—regarding self-imposed silence, how Government and the Congress Party non-co-operated with the Fazl Ali Commission. Suffice it to say that the Fazl Ali Commission while taking this decision had no authorised version or the memorandum of the Government of Mysore and of the ruling party. They were in a fix. Those people say that they were gagged and prevented—that is a matter which concerns them, but my only complaint is that during that period when the Fazl Ali Commission came here, Government did not present any official memorandum, nor

perhaps the ruling party. The States Reorganisation Commission have come to this conclusion in spite of the non-co-operation of the Government.

Now I come to the publication of the S.R.C. Report. When the S.R.C. Report was published, it was a signal for a good deal of commotion and exhibition of excitement, which did not exist before that. All these divergent opinions and controversy and these unfortunate happenings have followed the publication of the S.R.C. Report. It was a signal for a good deal of excitement and I have already repeated that the Government also became divided. The three Ministers fell out. I am wondering if there is administration at all. It became a period of agitation. Sharp differences of opinion were exchanged. This was very unfortunate. It would have been very magnanimous of them if they had approved of the Report and invited all those helpless people to come into their fold. On the other hand, they have put forward slogans like 'Mysore for Mysore' and they have been asking for the formation of two Karnatakas.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Not correct. They have not put forward the slogan 'Mysore for Mysoreans'.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Maddur).—It is not correct to say that they were for two Karnatakas. They were for one United Karnataka, keeping Mysore State separate.

Sri MOHAMED IMAM.—All right. Mysore and Karnataka. I would like to give the reasons for this sudden change in their attitude and policy. I need not go far off. The S.R.C. Report has given these reasons. They made their own enquiries and state that this controversy over Karnataka did not exist before and is only a recent one. It is only when the Karnataka issue became a live affair that this agitation started. This is what they have observed :

"With the reorganisation of States becoming a live political issue, however, some differences of opinion have recently arisen about the territorial set-up of the proposed Karnataka State. These differences relate principally to two matters, namely, the financial prospect of the Karnataka State and the desirability of integrating, in the proposed Karnataka State, the State of Mysore which claims to have a distinct administrative and cultural tradition. It is no longer assumed as it was, for instance, assumed in the Nehru Committee's Report that the Karnataka areas outside Mysore will be financially self-sufficient, or that they will have a surplus of revenue over expenditure. In fact, a committee appointed by the Mysore Government known as the Fact Finding Committee has arrived at the conclusion that the position is quite the contrary. Since the Karnataka areas outside Mysore are regarded as undeveloped, and are likely to have a financial deficit, there has grown up in the last two or three years opposition to the unification of Mysore with other Karnataka areas."

Again, they have made this improtant observation :

"It has been suggested to us that the basic reason why two States have sometimes been demanded instead of one is either political or religious apprehension, or perhaps, a combination of both. It has been estimated that Lingayats or Veerasaivas constitute about 25 to 49 per cent of the population in the Karnataka areas outside Mysore at present. The other important section of the Kannadigas, namely, the Vokkaligas, similarly constitute a little less than 29 per cent of the population of the Mysore. In the united Karnataka, it has been estimated that a little more than 20 per cent of the population may be Lingayats, between 13 and 14 per cent Vokkaligas, and about 17 to 18 per cent Harijans."

"It is clear that no one community will, therefore, be dominant,

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

and any one section can be reduced to the status of a minority, if other groups combine against it. These estimates of the communal composition of the new State are naturally not firm, because the figures which have been quoted vary considerably. They serve, however, to illustrate the problem."

2-30 P.M.

It is urged that all this advocacy for Karnataka is a manoeuvre for power politics to get more power or to get into power. It is stated from the other section, that the opposition to Karnataka is a sinister plot to retain their domination and enjoy the fruits of power. Sir, personally, I have great respect for both these major communities. In fact, the S.R.C. Report conveys the impression that the fight over Karnataka is a fight between two major communities and is a fight based on communal considerations. I do not want to rub them on the wrong side. But let me tell that there is a good deal of truth because when power has been vested, when power has been enjoyed, there is some reluctance to part with that power and forego the advantages of that power. So, if there had been communal considerations, then there must be a remedy. In my opinion, to eradicate all these communal evils and considerations and as a decisive guarantee against domination of any party or community, the only remedy is the formation of a united Karnataka on the lines suggested by the States Reorganisation Commission wherever it has been pointed by them that if Karnataka is formed, no community will dominate, no party will dominate and there will be a healthy and contented Karnataka. That will be the cure for all these communal evils which exist in the State. So, on that consideration, Sir, they have recommended the formation of Karnataka ; that is the main and important consideration. Let both the communities be fair and generous to all others who are interested in the formation of Karnataka.

Now coming to some reasons which is advanced for the retention of *status quo*, I think some of these points were explained yesterday by the Chief Minister. First of all, I come to the theory of their forming two States in Karnataka itself. I am not bothered with the name. They want that Mysore should be retained and others to form their own State. I think this theory of two States or two Karnatakas, let me say for my own convenience, is of recent origin. It was never suggested before. Even, Sir, when I was speaking on the Fact Finding Committee Report, I said there is a suggestion for the formation of two Karnatakas. Then there was an interruption : " Who said two Karnatakas? " So, this two Karnatakas theory has taken origin and is being sponsored seriously only after the publication of the S.R.C. Report. Sir, a section of the people in the State of Mysore may desire for the formation of two States among people who speak a common language and enjoy a similar culture. But it is not advocated and approved by others. Karnataka question is not merely a question of Mysore. It is a question of entire Karnataka. If the Kannadigas living outside Mysore wanted to have a separate State they would have had it long ago. But Mysore people themselves prevented the formation of Karnataka. And now at the final stage when their ambition is about to be cherished, the dissidents ask them to form their own Karnataka. It is certainly not desirable, nor is it equitable nor is it just to ask them to form their own State. It looks very uncharitable on our part and very selfish and against our promises and obligation.

Sir, the second point I want to mention is about the dangers of the theory of two Karnatakas.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has to close within ten minutes.

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I think I will close before 3 o' Clock. The theory of two Karnatakas leads to very dangerous conclusions. Supposing a section insists on two Karnatakas to be formed. How are you going to form two Karnatakas? Within the State itself there are a majority of people who want two Karnatakas. Another section

may state that they want to retain Mysore as it is. What about those people who want to join Karnataka? Are you going to split up Mysore itself and hand it over to another State? I think this theory is very dangerous and I wish my friends ought not to put forward this theory and never ask for the formation of two Karnatakas. Whether they form Karnataka or not is their own look-out. Let us not concern ourselves with it. But our main concern is this: there are 20 million people speaking Kannada language, enjoying similar culture and having similar customs who have been by force thrown into different States; now they desire that they must all live together and they must all work for the good of the country, that they must all share our joys and sorrows. The question is: do we agree to it or not. I say, Sir, as suggested by S. R. C. Report, we must advocate one Karnataka; we must give an opportunity for all of them to come together, live with us and work with us. That is the only solution. The two other reasons given in favour of two Karnatakas are these. It has been stated that those areas are very backward. In fact, there is an amendment asking only for Managalore excluding other parts of Karnataka. They want only the developed portions and they do not want undeveloped portions; they want to have what is good for them; they do not want what is not acceptable to them.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is human nature.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—But even that they have said. Since North Karnataka is backward and undeveloped, they do not want it.

A MEMBER.—Kollegal is also undeveloped and backward.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—So also Jagalur. Sir, it has been pointed out last time that it is wrong and incorrect to say that Bombay Karnataka is undeveloped. They are advanced in respect of education, medical facilities; in communication also, they are advanced and their natural wealth and resources are enormous. They have got mighty rivers which can be harnessed and made use of for irrigation. There are depths of forests; if North Karnataka comes to us we will be the masters of the entire forest wealth of that area. It has been pointed out to us that the theory of backwardness is not correct on page 92 of the Report:

> "The problems of the transition, in short, can and should be dealt with over a reasonable period; and the assumption which has sometimes been made that the Karnataka areas outside Mysore are particularly backward seems to us to be quite unwarranted. Bombay Karnataka in particular has enjoyed for a sufficiently long time the benefits of a progressive administration which has provided in this area educational facilities up to the University stage, cheap and adequate transport services run by one of the more important road transport corporations in the country and other amenities for the population. The extra cost, if any, of uniform standards of expenditure on the social services cannot, therefore, in our opinion, be very great; and on the whole, the mere fact that some administrative problems will be created and will need to be tackled in the first few years cannot be used as an argument against unification."

So, Sir, I can state with authority of the Report and from my own personal knowledge that Karnataka areas are not at all backward. Regarding finances, it is said that the financial liability and burden will be very high on the State of Mysore and we will have to meet their cost. The net liability, the net deficit after unification, as pointed out by them and also by the Fact Finding Committee is only about a crore of rupees. Sir, now what is the deficit of the present Mysore State? It is in my opinion nearly Rs. 3 crores. After the formation of Karnataka, the deficit in this area will be only one crore of rupees. So, I am perfectly justified in presuming that the financial position of the rest of the Karnataka is much better at present than that of Mysore. Sir, when we discussed the Second Five-Year Plan, I stated what the financial position of the State is. The

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

Second Five-Year Plan is for Rs. 100 crores and we have not got the resources to implement that. It was then pointed out that the entire sum must come through Central assistance and we have not got a single pie of our own. I had stated previously in unmistakable terms that, after integration, the State of Mysore has practically become the pensioner of the Central Government. I have repeated that statement often. So where is the question of finacial liability? We will be in the same position as we are if not in the worst position. Even for development, the finances should come from the Centre. So, lèt us not worry about finances. I may point out the advantages of the formation of Karnataka. At present, it may be a very difficult thing; at present the prospect of having a huge area may discourage us; the prospect ot having a huge area may lead us to think that the administration may be very difficult; but let us be on the opitimistic side. Sir, I think last time, I gave one example. Columbus discovered America in the year 1495. Afterwards a band of pilgrims went there. When they went there they did not find the City of New York, Washington or the present industrialised or advanced America that we see now. They saw big rivers, mountains and other resources. They went there with a pilgrim spirit. They built up that country and now America is the most powerful and the wealthiest country. Similarly, Sir, Karnataka. We must proceed on that basis. Sir, we have got rivers Krishna, Ghatagprabha and Mallaprabha and Mangeera. If they are only harnessed, Karnataka will become a first class country, a leading agricultural State in the whole of India. There are many industries also started and there is the possibility of starting many more industries. What is more, Sir—one important point for which we must do anything to achieve Karnataka is, we are going to get a seacoast of two hundred miles which will be a big achievement. No country has prospered or advanced without a seacoast. Sir, we have been struggling ever since the time of Sir M. Visvesvaraya to get a Port. To get Bhatkal, we were trying since Sir Mirza Ismail's time and I too was working for the same. Sri K. C Reddy and Sri Mariappa approached the Bomby Government for that. Now, an opportunity has presented itself to get the entire seacoast with Malpe. Very soon there will be railway connection between Mangalore and Bangalore. What glorious prospects will there be then! But some of us do not want such a prospect. It is true that some of my friends claim Mangalore and nothing else. But I may say that this object will never be achieved. If you are willing to take, take the entire area. You cannot choose the best and refuse the rest. We shall have fisheries, the port and what not. What is Mysore now? It is said it is advanced, far advanced. On the other hand I have said many times and say now that the State of Mysore is the poorest State in the whole of India, it is landlocked on all sides, by Bombay on one side and Madras on the other. We have not got access to the sea. We are contented to be locked up as we are, lazy people as we are. We do not want to achieve big things. We say—let us be satisfied. That is the mentality of our people. That is why many non-Mysoreans have come and lived and prospered here. The plantation labour is non-Mysorean. The K G.F. labour is non-Mysorean. All important industries are monopolised by non-Mysoreans. We are all quarrelling over communal matter, interested in posts or offices. That is why our country has been reduced to poverty. There may be some prosperity—there may be one Krishnarajasagar. But that is not enough. Our country must develop industrially and economically. It must produce wealth. It must solve unemployment. To achieve all these things a United Karnataka is the only solution. I submit that a person very rarely gets an opportunity to serve. When he gets that opportunity, he must not let go that. When I was a scout, my greatest ambition was. . . .

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—Are you not one now?

Sri J. JMOHAMAD IMAM.—I still continue to be an active scout. My one greatest ambition was to save a person from drowning. But no man or woman would drown himself or herself in my presence, to enable me to jump into the river and rescue the drowned and be a hero. I thought I had one or two opportunities of rescuing, but they knew swimming. So when we have got an opportunity to do genuine and real service, we should not let it go. It is a question of serving the entire population of Karnataka, serving those who have been dismembered and thrown into different parts of the country, serving those who have been pining to rejoin their brethren, their kith and kin and for which they struggled and struggled. Now, an opportunity is given to this House to do service to achieve their object. If you all jointly and unanimously. . .

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home).—Are they poor relations ?

Sri J. MOHAMAD IMAM.—Not economically, but conditions are poor. That opportunity is given to this House. Sir, it is very rare that such an opportunity comes in our way. We must all avail ourselves of this opportunity. Now, it may depend on the verdict of this House. Are we going to help them ? Are we going to help our brethren to come together ? Or, do you think and say : let them look after themselves ; we do not care what happens to them. The service, to bring together all the parts of Karnataka under one fold, under one banner and under one administration. . . .

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—There is no banner.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.— ...... under one administration is the greatest service that this House can do. If you miss this opportunity, I think the odium that will be attached to it will be very serious. If you take hold of this opportunity, if you help for the formation of United Karnataka, if you take all your brethren, all your kith and kin, then I am sure, that the name of this House and the members will go down to posterity as persons being responsible to bring together all those dismembered portions of Karnataka under one administration.

I have said that this in not a secular call. This movement should not be thought of in money values, in terms of rupees, annas and pies. This is a movement, which is all for one and one for all. I stated last time that Karnataka stands on four pillars—the pillar of Mysore, the pillar of North Karnataka, the pillar of Hyderabad and the pillar of Madras. It is only on these four pillars that we should build together the edifice of Karnataka. There is only the pillar of Mysore now. Unless all the four pillars become strong, we cannot erect. It is not a secular matter. So far as those people are concerned, it is a spiritual conception, a conception which will never die and which we must always cherish. We must always see that this conception never dies and that it is accomplished and materialises. All of us must see this United Karnataka becomes a living reality and to achieve this, we should not exclude ourselves ; we should not think on partisan spirit of the people of Mysore, the people of Madras, etc. The people of Karnataka must become Founder-partners to establish the State of Karnataka.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepally-Gauribidanur).—See how he hates Andhras ! He never mentions them even.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, the Andhras have been claiming Telengana. I will be so happy if they succeed in their object. If Andhra people also want to join Karnataka, I have no objection. The Chief Minister mentioned Andhra Karnataka Samrajya. If that is formed, I will be very happy. Because these are days when . . . .

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City North).—These are days of republics.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Andhra-Karnataka State we shall say Sarvajanika Samrajya.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Bombay is a bilingual State.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I just wanted to say that I love my brethern there. I always treat my neighbour and friend with great respect. Most of them are living in the State of Mysore. Sir, I make two distinctions. I have great respect for persons and I believe in their desire to think that Mysore

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

should remain for themselves. It is their genuine desire. I am also one with people who believe in the State of Karnataka. But I don't like persons who try to take away parts of Mysore to Andhra.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Is it your property?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is neither yours. You are remaining here.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY.—They as well as ourselves have remained from 1799.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Andhras have got more than enough. Anyhow, I do not think they will come in our way. Sir, I think I have taken much time. I have done my duty dispassionately. I have expressed whatever I felt for the good of the country and for the good of the State. Many people may doubt the advantages and the benefits that accrue on the formation of Karnataka. But posterity will show the uprightness and the advantages of the formation of Karnataka. In these days small States have not much prospect in all respects. The bigger the States the greater the advantage and the greater the influence one can use and greater the benefit one can achieve. I thank the House and the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the House will rise and meet at 3-30 P.M.

The House rose for Lunch at Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, first I must express my gratefulness to the Party because there was keen discussion whether they should be freedom of expression and voting on this important subject or not. Keeping in view that we are running democracy based on adult suffrage, keeping in view the importance of the issue before the country, the Party came to the conclusion that there should be freedom of expression for the Ministers, for the members and freedom of vote. I believe, Sir, that this good tradition that has been adopted will be endorsed by all democratic peoples; and I appeal to the other parties also to give the same latitude, to give the same freedom for their members. And I am very happy that even the Chief Minister consulted us whether he had got the freedom of expression. We said: yes, and accordingly he has spoken.

Now, Sir, the S.R.C. Report is before us. The States Reorganisation Commission was appointed by the Government of India and they were interested in examining as to how best the States in India should be reorganised—not as sovereign units we have got to remember, but as administrative units, in order to promote welfare, in order to promote proper planning therefor. In this context, to hear the cries of Vishala Andhra, Samyukta Karnataka and Samyukta Maharashtra and Aki Kerala, these phrases which were very familiar, and which were very necessary up to the date of freedom, are rather jarring. Well, my hon'ble friend puts it that this cry of linguistic States commenced in 1905 and he wanted to trace the history up to 1947 as one period. In a sense it is correct. In 1905, it is the partition of Bengal, the partition of unilingual State, that brought about that cry that Bengal should be united. It is that cry which commenced and because of the partition it caught the imagination of the people and it was followed. Gandhiji came on the scene in the year 1921. He is the Father of the Nation, he had the insight and he had the foresight and he had seen the spiritual vision to guide us. He saw the country; at that time there were 500 and odd States of large complexities, States with different customs and manners, one State speaking several languages, etc. There were small units like Coorg. In fact there was a State with less than one square mile. He examined as to how best to focus the national thought at that time, because it was cut up in 500 and odd States, into different compartments and he thought that it was the language

that should be centre of focus at that time. Therefore he emphasised that the Congress Provinces should be based on linguistc basis so that in place of these 500 and odd States,—there could be about 14 or 15 States and in the case of large linguistic units one or two focal points. That was the method to bring together the diversified and compartmentalised loyalties of the time and to reduce it to a fewer centres. The linguistic weapon was made use of. It served the purpose. It served the purpose very well till 1947 and when that service was over, in fact, he himself has said so and, particularly, late Sardar Patel, declared that many a time—implemented it, and Pandit Nehru is repeating the same, How did Patel rectify it? Take our own case. The Indian National Congress did not do political work in Indian States; it did constructive work and the Mysore Congress in 1938 took up the political work and the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee was doing constructive work nominally and there was nothing to its credit, but still just as other linguistic provinces were brought together, in its wake Mysore was also included. After the attainment of freedom, there was a clamour that the political work should also be given to the K.P.C.C. He said 'no; Mysore is a unit, political State, it is a good unit.' Therefore in addition to the political work, constructive work was also added to the Mysore Congress. The linguistic principle which was being heard from all platforms was given a quietus. Therefore I submit that the linguistic force, the instrumental linguistic force which was necessury till 1947 was not made use of and is being discouraged very forcibly. But unfortunately the ghost is haunting the mind of many and I am afraid, unless the ghost that spreads linguism is laid to rest as early as possible it will eat into our vitals. I do not want to name the States. I would request some of my friends to visit one of the linguistic States and see how those people are getting on. I do not want to comment further because it is our neighbouring State and it is better that I do not speak further on this issue.

Next, Sir, the other factor is, that everyone of us has been speaking of Mysore as the Great Mysore. I would like to know whether the great political organisation in Mysore, the Mysore Congress or the Mysore Provincial Congress Committee, not the excutive body, not the head of it but this great body, has at any time said anything definite on this very important and vital matter. Such matters will not rest on the decision of the executive committee but should rest on the decision of the Provincial Congress Committee. I believe, Sir, nobody could make a statement on behalf of Mysore unless duly authorised; and no representative elected on adult suffrage, elected by nearly 75,000 to 80,000 people could say authoritatively whether this body, the Legislature has expressed its definite opinion. When the States Reorganisation Commission came, it is our misfortune, Sir, that neither the premier political organisation nor the Government nor this body spoke at that time. (A voice: It was your mistake). Yes, it was my mistake. If I have committed a sin, let me be punished, but let not posterity curse us for our default. That is what I spoke to Pandit Nehru also. In my contacts at Delhi with many of the top leaders, they have said: your case has gone by default. I said "True. But should that default end in punishment of the nation and of posterity?" I appeal to them: let us go by the democratic practice by which we swear. Whatever be the verdict of this House we have got to bow down to it so far as we are concerned, so far as the Ministers are concerned and so far as the people are concerned and I am sure that our great leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru would be happy to hear that by the democratic process we have come to some definite opinion on which they and we, all of us could defend. Therefore, I say that the restoration of the democratic process, the opportunity given to every one of us to say that this is the opinion of the Mysore people, this opportunity is most welcome. We are very grateful

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)

for the same. Some imputations have been made. It is also personal. Therefore a personal explanation is necessary. Let it not be thought that I am saying it in vanity. All my friends, all my relations and all political organizations know how I have grown, what I have done. It was in 1923 just after Gandhiji came on the scene, two years later, in one of his articles he said that 'unless you are free you should not produce children, you should not marry. I may submit it caught my imagination. By that time, fortunately or unfortunately I was married, but a year or two later my wife died and I have kept up to that counsel. I believe if any friend of mine, any acquaintance of mine and any stranger could say anything about my transgression, I will bow down. What I mean to say is that in order to serve truth and the country, I have carried out the mandate of Mahatma Gandhi.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—(Molakalmuru).—Now that we have achieved freedom, are you willing to have a wife and children ? (*Laughter*).

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I thank him for the suggestion. There were some personal allegations of narrowness and selfishness. During this period I have served here, in Karnataka, in Bombay, in Hyderabad and in several other places. As all my friends know, we were actually in wilderness from 1942. Not only myself but all the other male and female members of our family were in jail for over a year. If that were to be construed as narrowness and selfishness I shall be very happy to have and serve better examples. Therefore, solely with a view to place my light on the present situation with devotion and with a motive that it might be useful for the present and beneficial to posterity, I am making these remarks.

About linguistic province I have said a little and I should add a little more with the permission of the Chief Minister. I sent a written memorandum to the Commission. I have not done anything behind the back of the Chief Minister. I swear to it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—But without the consent of this House.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—If all the other members had done the same thing, I would have followed suit. Therefore, the question of doing something behind the back, the question of doing sabotage—these are the words which are used but cannot be substantiated. I shall read for the benefit of this House the letter that I have addressed to the States Reorganisation Commission.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Was it typed in your house and on a letter-head ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Yes, in my house.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—What is the date of this letter ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—9th July 1955.

"My Dear Sri Pannikkar,

After my talks with you on 1st July 1955, I went straight to Mr. Fazl Ali and Dr. Kunzru. I discussed with them about the States Reorganisation as I did with you. As desired by you, I am submitting this my memorandum on the re-organisation of the Indian State-system based on recognised principles and policies. They are :—

(i) avoidance of linguistic unification and the inherent fissiparous tendencies ;

(ii) sublimation of the linguistic idea by carving out multilingual States on the pattern of India itself or in the alternative, elimination of the evils of linguism by dissecting the linguistic region into more than one State unit ;

(iii) securing equality and uniformity (as far as possible) in respect of the population of the States in the future set-up of the States-system (making the smallest linguistic unit like Assam or Orissa, as the basis for the creation of other States) ; and

(iv) creation of State units composed of compact and viable areas neither too large nor too small, and capable of initiative and

enterprise and well able to maintain intimate and close contacts with the people.

In this view so far as the South is concerned there could and should be more than one Maharashtra, Andhra, Karnatic, Tamil, and Kerala States; and as for the North, several Hindi and more than one Bengali and Gujarati States. For a sub-continent like India, there could be easily about 35 uniform (as far as possible) State units in the place of the present 29 disparate units.

In Mysore a large majority of people hold the view that Mysore should continue in its present form without any dissection of its territory or any accretion to the same. However, some feel that South Canara and Coorg may be added. But the bulk of opinion is against linguistic unification and the creation of a large and unwieldy Kannada State. . . . "

This clearly shows that I have tried my best to take into consideration how India should be divided and what should be the place of Mysore. I will not deal with other matters because though it is pertinent, it may not be quite necessary. As I have said, I have sent this letter, sent a copy of it to the Chief Minister and I believe that my friends will not at least hereafter say that I have sabotaged the whole thing.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It would have been better if you had sent a copy to every member of this House.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Probably then all this controversy would not have arisen.

Now this ideology I arrived at, after going through the J.V.P. Report—the Report of the Committee of Pandit Jawaharlal, Vallabhbhai Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramiah. There they discouraged the continuance of these linguistic ideologies. One member was saying "ನೆಲದಾಹ" that is, thirst for land. If it were to be a big sovereign State, I can understand that in order to gain an advantage, in order to strengthen oneself against an enemy; one has got to expand oneself, but now in the place of the 14 or 15 linguistic States envisaged by Mahatma Gandhi we have got one Central State for the whole of India. Our devotion is for the maintenance of that unity and strength. Therefore, this cry of linguism, the formation of linguistic States, however big or small, is out of date. So the main consideration is how to divide India into proper administrative units without creating such States as would be dangerous to its progress or such States as would develop fissiparous tendencies. That is the main object. Take for instance two taluks within a State, say Hole-narasipur and Hassan Taluks. In both these taluks I have got lands. Should these taluks be united or separate? That is the problem. If Hole-Narasipur and Hassan are in Mysore and I have got property in both these taluks, I have got interest in both. To decide whether it should be under one unit or two units, the criterion would be what is the area of these Taluks, how to organise it, whether it would be better to have the centre in Hole-Narsipur or in Hassan. Taking all these factors into consideration, we decide into one or two taluks. It is on the same principle that we have got to decide the State reorganisation system. It is only then we get a correct answer.

I take another analogy, how America and other democratic countries have gone about this business of State formation. I do not take Russia because it is an authoritarian country. I take America advisedly because it is a democratic country just like ours. I have got the figures from the American Embassy. It has a population of 160 millions. The number of States is 50. The average works out at 30 lakhs per State. The total population of the U.S.A. is 15,06,97,361. India : 35,68,29,485. Number of States in U.S.A. 50. In the Indian Republic as it is we have got, as I said, 29 disparate units; as proposed by the Commission it is 17. The average population for a State in the U.S.A. is 30,75,000.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—What is the area of the State?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The case will be still worse. I am giving the figures, that I have got. There are 16 States in the U.S.A. with a population of less than 10 lakhs; 5 States between 10-20 lakhs, 12 States between 20-30 lakhs, 8 States between 30-40 lakhs, 3 States between 40-50 lakhs, one State between 60-70 lakhs, one State between 70-80 lakhs, one State between 80-90 lakhs, and 3 between 100-200 lakhs and there is no State with a population above 200 lakhs.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—What about the area?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Regarding area, the area of the U.S.A. is twice that of India. (*A Member.—It is more*). If it is more, the case will be still worse. Now, Sir, according to S. R. C. proposals, there will be two States below 10 lakhs, one State below 20 lakhs, one State between 40 to 50 lakhs, one State between 70 to 80 lakhs, one State between 90 to 100 lakhs, six States between 100 to 200 lakhs, three States between 200 to 300 lakhs, two States between 300 to 400 lakhs, one State between 400 to 500 lakhs and one State above 600 lakhs. These are unwieldy units.

Now, Sir, about State administration we know, we are not sovereign States.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—We are part of the sovereign States.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—One other factor I have to say. We are guided by what Mahatma Gandhi has said. He is the father of the Nation. He was for decentralisation. He was arguing for transferring power to smaller units. Now does this concentration of States into big units decentralise power? America is wise enough, in order to enthuse the people, to allow them to have initiative, enterprise and achievement to have small population unit. In our own country we have U.P. for more than 60 to 70 years; similary we have Mysore also. If big States meant greater work, greater prosperity, greater enthusiasm of the people, certainly Mysore would not have been called the model State, but U.P. would heve been called so. It is because of its compactness which is one of the characteristics, one of the main reasons that is responsible for initiative, enterprise, and achievement of Mysore. Similarly, Baroda; similarly, Travancore. It is the big State which has not been able to do what these small States are doing. Therefore in a State system, it should have been the first duty of the Commission to consider what is the optimum limit and what is the minimum limit of the State in area as well as population. They have not considered it at length. They only state that big States are necessary in border areas. Regarding others, they do not say anything. Nor do they see the point that in a Federation where there should be transfer of power, the units must be uniform as much as possible. There is violation on both sides, namely, the absence of optimum limit as well as the lack of uniformity in the formation of State system. Therefore, I say, the proposals of the Commission are not acceptable, particularly because Mysore with a sizeable population and as a unit is developing quite well; there is no need at all to disturb it. Even according to the Report, they have laid down three considerations for the formation of States. What are the circumstances and conditions under which a State could be disturbed is explained in para 193:

> "The considerations which we might bear in mind in the light of what has been stated in the preceding paragraphs are:—
>
> (a) no change should be made otherwise than for clear and compelling reasons;
>
> (b) the permanent advantages and possible recurring economies which can result from the scheme of reorganisation should be such as to compensate for the dislocation; and
>
> (c) the administrative consequences of reorganisation

should be clearly thought out and suitable machinery should be devised in order to minimise the time required to deal with them."

Therefore what is the inevitability of merging Mysore with an area much larger than itself and with a population much bigger than itself? What are the benefits that we are going to derive? These facts have not been discussed. Thus, the States Reorganisation Commission, I deeply regret to say, has not bestowed that amount of thought or study as to the size of the State, the compactness of the State and they have produced a mosaic picture, much worse than what it is.

Next, Sir, only one point was made out by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister regarding the size of the Legislature. I want to speak about the size of the Legislature also. He said a larger legislature would add to its dignity, stability, etc. I will give you two instances. The English Parliament has about 620 members; the French Chamber of Deputies has 584, both are fairly big enough. You find stability in England and the reverse of it in France. This is common knowledge to everybody.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—But the Civil Service is very good in England.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—The mode of election in France is different.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Whatever it is, coming back to India, Mysore and Travancore are more or less on par. You find better stability here than in Travancore. Why? That is the question. Wherever the party system works properly, wherever the number of parties are few and manageable, the Government will be stable. In France, on account of innumerable number of parties, they cannot have a stable Government. In Travancore-Cochin because of a number of small parties capturing the Legislature, they cannot have a stable Government. Therefore, it is not the number that gives stability. It is the political party that gives stability.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It applies to both either small or big States.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It does not depend upon size; it depends upon political parties, the number of parties and their strength. Now, Sir, some statements were made which, as a student of history, it is difficult for me to swallow. They state that all Karnataka was united and it has now fallen to pieces. I should like to know at what time was the whole of Karnataka area under one regime? It is a plain question I am putting.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—During the time of Vijayanagar Kingdom and also Tippu Sultan.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—During Vijayanagar Kingdom, Hampi spread up to the Northern parts of Andhra State. During Tippu Sultan's time Mysore spread southwards and probably did not go beyond Chitaldrug District. If you show me any period when the whole of Karnataka was under one regime, I will keep quiet. Statements are made which are not true to history. Let us make true statements and then draw inferences. On the contrary what does history show? In the North Karnataka, there were Chalukya people, Rastrakuta people, Kalyana people.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That was perhaps 2,500 years ago.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I am sorry; Chalukyas were in sixth century; Rastrakutas were in 7th century; Kalyanas were in 13th century. I request you to refresh your memory.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Nobody thought of linguistic States in those days.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Quite right; I entirely agree with you. Nobody thought of why there should be linguistic States.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Much depended upon compactness in those days.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Yes. In the South Karnataka there were Gangas, Kadambas, Hoisalas and Yadavas. The North Karnataka looked towards North and North-east. The South Karnataka looked to the South and South-east and there was no Karnataka kingdom comprising the entire area.

Sri G. SIVAPPA (Holalkere).—What about Bellary during the time of Tippu?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Yes, he made raids. But I am speaking of the establishments of the Kingdom.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Industries).—Who made the statement that all Kannada areas formed part of one Kingdom?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—My Hon'ble friend sitting opposite said so. But that is no argument against unifying them. Let us have proper historical data as a guide; that is all I am saying. I have stated about compactness; I have said about history. Now four Administrative units are to be brought under one fold. We are having an experiment of Bellary. Two years have elapsed. The laws have not yet been made uniform; taxes have not become one; I do not blame them; I do not blame myself either. I only say that the process of unification is not complete.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—What happened when 500 and odd States were integrated?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—If you go to Rajastan, you will understand what it is. If you see even Travancore-Cochin, you will understand. There is neither harmony nor order. In fact in Rajastan there is no law.

A MEMBER.—Do you on that account propose breaking up those States again?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I cannot speek with any authority. But I speak of States which I know. What I mean to say is, these four units with different administrative systems and practices, with different Local laws, different methods of taxation, and different services are to be brought under one fold of United Karnataka. I do not say it is impossible to cure them. It will take a long time and in the meanwhile they have to suffer and we have to suffer. Why? Let us be prudent in our approach.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—For the good of the country.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Let us see facts and do it. Therefore, in order to harmonise these elements, in order to bring about uniformity which is necessary, we cannot have discriminatory laws, different laws, different systems of taxation and different services; it will take very long time to harmonise, in my opinion, it will take 50 years; even the S.R.C. Report concedes that there is this difficulty but it says that it could be overcome, I also say it could be overcome in 50 years and not in 5 or 10 years. Why should there be this suffering for them as well as to us?

Next regarding social factor, the Report itself has said much. Probably it has said things which they need not have stressed. They have unnecessarily stressed them. The remedy they suggest is something worse than the disease. They say why 16 per cent of the people should not dominate. I am neither a Vokkaliga nor a Lingayet. So I can appreciate their argument why 16 per cent should not dominate. But they say that Veerasaivas will be 20 per cent. Is that fair? If the domination of 16 per cent of the population is bad, the domination of 20 per cent of the population is still worse. Is that a remedy? Further I do not want to speak much of this, because, we are moving towards a casteless society. I hope it will be quite all right. But since that point has been pressed, I would say, if the premises is but correct, the inference drawn by the Commission is not correct. That is my submission. The remedy is worse than the disease.

Now, regarding economics, I am glad that they have looked into this Fact Finding Committee Report. They have stated that there will be deficit of one to one and a half crores. But it will be more.

(*Interruption*).

Sir, regarding the economic conditions, they have said in their report that there will be deficits, that there will be difficulties and that they should be overcome. My submission is that they have minimised these things. They should have given it in true figures. For instance, in Hyderabad, especially in Raichur and Gulbarga, they get more than 1¼ crores under excise revenue. If it comes into Mysore, it will not be permanent

feiture. It will disappear. Then what would be the fate of Mysore? The argument is put forward that there is the Centre. We can ask them. We can go to them with a begger's bowl. But how much and to what extent? And, would that come without a corresponding contribution from the State? Therefore, I submit, according to my calculations—it is roughly...

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—There are the five districts of Mysore which are dry.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The e are four more wet districts. When we lose this income what would be the position? It will be difficult. Because one position is difficult, why should we invite another position which is equally, if not more difficult.

A MEMBER.—According to the Fact Finding Committee, Gulburga and Raichur have surplus budget to the extent of one crore.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—But Gulbarga and Raichur have the heaviest taxes on land, much heavier than here. Excise revenue is one of the best there, even better than the land revenue. As I said, they are not stable factors. The remedy suggested is to go to Delhi with the beggar's bowl. But to what extent and how much can we expect; and whether we would have them without a part contribution from the State—that would be the point. At any rate, it is conceded that there will be difficulties and we have got to find out whether we coul tide over those difficulties in reasonable time.

(The Chief Minister was entering and taking his seat).

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The Member was not speaking from his place.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Now, I am in my place.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—All that you have stated is *ultra vires*, because you were not speaking from your seat.

(*Laughter.*)

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Now, Sir, regarding culture—let me not be taken as a scare monger...... .

(*Interruption.*)

The present composition of the Mysore population—here, Sir, I do not include Bellary; without Bellary I am speaking. But the proportion would be the same.

(*Interruption.*)

I am very sorry for what has happended to Bellary. I will speak about it later. The Kannada-speaking people were 59.90 lakhs. This was in 1941. The Telugu speaking-people were 13.75 lakhs. I do not deal with other linguistic groups. In the proposed unified Karnataka, the Kannada population will be 124,18,000 and the Telugu-speaking people will be 18,78,000. To the Kannada people they are in the ratio of 4 : 1 at present. After unification, they will be in the ratio of 7:1. I do not know what my friends would say. Is that not a disturbance of the cultural factors? It will bring in new groups with their forces and the existing forces which are there will be attenuated by this intergration.

Now, Sir, Sri Imam, my Hon'ble friend, put me a question about politics that in my supposed talk with friends I have stated that in the proposed revised constituency, the position will be affected. Of what I said, he gave a garbled report. I will give the facts. In the integrated Karnataka, those who come for the Legislature—their number will be in excess of the numbers that Mysore will get for the simple reason that the population will be bigger and the distribution of the seats according to the new election rules will be based on that. Those who come afresh will have an outlook different from those who are here. I do not complain, but they are facts. Therefore, our effectiveness to that extent will be reduced. What should then happen?

Now, Sir, according to the test laid down by the S.R.C. Report, they have not shown the beneficial result to Mysore. On the contrary, in economic matters, in administrative matters, and I would add, in political matters, Mysore does not get any benefit, but it loses. Therefore, why should there be this intergration? At least, if it had been argued that there were fissiparaous tendencies and that to bring them

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)

together. They would have one Karnataka—that would have been an argument. Even that they deny themselves. They say that the whole of Karnataka, whether in Mysore or Hyderabad or in Bombay, the people are so united in spite of living under differing conditions, I wish to read that weighty sentence. The happy relations that we are having without being under one administrative system. . . .

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Become happier.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We are already happy. I will read that one sentence from para 357:

> "The agricultural, mineral, water and forest resources of Karnataka are considerable. We have no doubt that whichever way one may look at the problem, a united Karnataka will be found to have the essential unity of a culturally homogeneous and balanced economic region; and to a considerable extent, this unity is even independent of the ties of common language."

What does that speak? In spite of diversity and in spite of living in different systems, people are homogeneous. They are quite happy. On the contrary, after the formation of united Karnataka, there will be difficulties in economic, social and political matters. Why should there be difficulties known in the way of development.

Hon'ble Sri Imam was saying that these people have some disease or ailment, and want two Karnatakas. I say that they (demanding one Karnataka), are being haunted by this ghost of linguism. When will they be free? The ghost is dead. Linguism is dead. Let it not revive. I am wondering. When a unit of ninety lakhs of people in thirty thousand square miles like Mysore has done fairly well, and has been the source of strength to India, and when there is another place with an equal area population and resources, why should they not form another State? If they form, they won't be hampered. But we will have two beautiful Karnatakas. Have we not got the capacity to do it? Considering all the factors, the resources and etc., why don't you think of it?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Instead of two beauties, I want one beauty only.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—In their own arguments they stand defeated.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—When other parts were being integrated into Mysore, why did you not oppose for the same reasons?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I will answer that. Kindly refer to my letter to States Reorganisation Commission. If we have done a good thing, they must thank us. Bellary itself could not have formed a State. It is true, we welcomed.. .

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagapalli-Gudubanada).—How can they form a new State.

Sri B. Y. NEELE GOWDA (Pandavapura).—Sir, as you know, in spite of our differences, we are friends. But such interruptions are likely to disturb. I therefore appeal to the Chair not allow interruptions.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Therefore, Sir, it would add to our spirit of enterprise and adventure to have a separate Karnataka. It would add to our dignity if we brought up another State. For two reasons, I state this. One is that it won't hamper the growth and development of Mysore and the other is we will have brought in to existence another good state. It is as forward as Mysore. When two States are formed, just as two brothers in a house help each other, why not we help each State? What is the harm, I submit for the consideration of this House, if they propose two different States? It will be an eye-opener. The linguistic ghost will be driven out. They will say: Look at Mysore; how Mysore has honestly and earnestly helped in the creation of two States. Would it not be a proud moment to all of us? I request my friends to think it over. I have been thinking over this problem for slveral years whether Mysore should continue as it is. But

after seeing the S.R.C. Report, I felt that South Kanara, Coorg and Kollegal, which have no other go, should be taken up by us. When I say that they might come into Mysore, it is at their wish. If they want to join with North Karnataka I have no objection.

The strength of mind depends upon three or four factors. The first, on it virility; the scond on its responsiveness, the third in its imagination and the fourth on memory. If we are paralysed, if we do not want to think, there is an end of progress. Therefore I appeal to this House to think of this problem as an administrative problem but not as a linguistic problem and devise proper things; see what other countries have done; see how these things we should do, and see how the objective has to be achieved. Therefore, I submit once again to my friends to have an open mind, to think and devise two Karnatakas, if they agree with me. That is the method of progress and that is the method of vitality and development.

Well, Sir, having set out these factors, supported by reasons, by illustrations and examples as to how the State System of India should be organised and how Mysore in particular should be treated, I am confident the right thing will be done. I have studied the Karnataka problem pretty well. I think, it should be so solved as to enable these two units to develop properly into their full stature without one affecting the interests of the other.

Sir, some stray arguments were made. They referred to the 1946 convention. It was not a permanent political body. It is true that some friends of like minds meet there. We have remember two things regarding that. It was before independence when the political objective for freedom was foremost and secondly, the convention was of an *ad hoc* nature. Should they bind other members of other organisations, Sir? In the year 1946 when the move for United Karnataka was started, Hyderabad was still an independent State and similarly Mysore. If they thought of it, was only on ideological grounds but not on practical grounds. It is only after the integration of Hyderabad and Mysore it became a practical subject about 1950 and not earlier. Therefore the argument put forth in 1946 by some people, I said is not relevant. Very important people might have said, but that does not commit the organisation which did not participate in that cause.

Now, Sir, one other statement has been made. A reference has been made to the Constituent Assembly Resolution. It is better that we see what that resolution contains. The first draft was proposed; it was discussed and the final resolution was adopted by the Constituent Assembly. I refer to sub-clause (2) of the resolution. It reads as follows.—

> "(2) There shall be a provision in the Constitution for the integration with Mysore of the neighbouring areas in the same manner as may be mutually *agreed upon* between the areas concerned and Mysore in accordance with the provision that may be laid down by the Constitution of India in this behalf."

I emphasise on the word 'agreed upon.' An agreement has been made, Sir, that in Mysore opinion is divided for inclusion of North Karnataka. Whose opinion should we take? We have to ascertain, according to me, the opinions of the concerned areas. It is for them together to decide, they should mutually agree upon terms. The imposition of the views of one upon the other, to say the least, is not democratic. We have sworn to democracy, and therefore, the argument that 50 per cent of people in Mysore will be represented by 50 persons and 150 of persons of North Karnataka and of the remaining part of Mysore represent the others is not correct. Arithmetically it may be all right, but morally and democratically it would neither e fair nor proper.

Sir, as I said, this is an important and sacred thing and I have also said that the voice of this House is the most potent and deciding factor to which all of us are bound; and not

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.).

only the present generation but the posterity as well. I appeal to them once again to lay the ghost that haunt us. That ghost is haunting them disabling them from seeing things in its realities and to have a proper decision. I hereby appeal on behalf of postertiy—that posterity might say that we have done well and done properly. I may kindly be given a few minutes more, Sir.

Regarding Bellary, greatest injustice has been done to the people of Bellary. Of course, this mater has been dealt with by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister and Sri Imam at great length. I do not want to say anything more. If we have to apply that test to determine whether the States Reorganisation Commission has done properly or not, if this test is applied to their treatment of Bellary, the Report should not be before us, it must be somewhere else. Therefore; Sir, the first thing that any Government, even this Government should give top priority to is to see that the proposal thereon is scrapped *in toto*. I hear that they have resorted to Satyagraha and I hear also that there are Hon'ble friends in Bangalore and Mysore who have taken the whole thing in an agitation mood, who are breaking the bones of some one or other. Some are in the hospital. From this platform I appeal to them not to resort to these things. These are matters of very high policy on which decision will have to be reached after very careful discussion and deliberation. No useful purpose would be served by breaking heads or hands. We are not going to achieve the object by such means. I am sorry, there are a number of students who have also taken part in this agitation. I appeal to them also not to resort to such means and to adopt the democratic method and to cease this method of agitation and I assure them also that this issue would be smoothly resolved in this House. Just as this House has resolved so many complicated problems on so many occasions, we have to resolve this also calmly by discussing the whole thing and arrive at the correct conclusion in the matter. Therefore I hope, Sir, that these ultra constitutional methods will be given up and they will take recourse to proper methods.

Next Sir, in the S.R.C. Report they have said that the order of Rajpramukhs should go. True according to the Socialistic Pattern of Society which we are devising they might not find a place. But consistent with the past pledges, and consistent with the present needs, due provision will have to be made for them and after my talks with great leaders in Delhi, I feel, Sir, they will get a fair deal. Lastly, this is a very important thing, Sir. In addition to the test of Bellary, another test about the name of Mysore may be applied to the S.R.C. Report to test its soundness. My Hon'ble friend President Channiah, immediately he saw the Report, he said, "I felt as if I heard that some one in my house was dead".

Sir, when two companies, two firms join, they will give a value for the goodwill in the interest of the development of the company, of the smooth working of the company, and for the future growth of the company. Here is a State which has become famous throughout India and even outside India; of whose strength, most of us when we go out, make the best use. To scrap out the name of Mysore without any value is the worst part of the S.R.C. Report.

Therefore I submit to this House to ponder over the issue of two Karnatakas. It will solve many a problem and bring happiness and prosperity to both Mysore and the North Karnataka.

Regarding Bellary, on behalf of myself, I say I will not leave any stone unturned to see that full justice is done to the people of Bellary.

With gratitude to the House I close my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I request the Hon'ble Members of this House at least now to put some time-limit upon the speeches to be made?

MEMBERS.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am frank enough to tell you that we cannot turn out the business within the stipulated time. I have no objection to continue the

debate provided the Government extends the time-limit.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ-ಹೊಸನಗರ).—ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಇವೊತ್ತು ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಾಗಿ ನಿನ್ನೆ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೂ, ಭಾಷಣಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರೂ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೀವೇ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಶ್ರೀ ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರೇ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರೀಗ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಇಮಾಂರವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಯವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ—ಅವರ ಕಡೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ—ಅಂತೂ ಅವರ ಕಡೆಯಿರುವ ಅನೇಕ ಜನರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾಯರೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅವರುಗಳು ಅವರವರ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೊಳಪಟ್ಟು ದೀರ್ಘಕಾಲ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಕುಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ, ಏಕೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಅವೊತ್ತೇ ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಶ್ರೀ ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೋ, ಶ್ರೀ ಇಮಾಂ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾಯರಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೋ, ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಈ ಮೂರು ಜನ ಮಾತನಾಡಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರಿಗೆ ಎರಡೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆಯ ಕಾಲವನ್ನೂ, ಇಮಾಂರವರಿಗೆ ಎರಡು ಘಂಟೆಯಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲವನ್ನೂ, ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾಯರಿಗೆ ಒಂದೂಕಾಲು ಘಂಟೆಯಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇತರರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದರೂ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಅಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾರರು. ನಾನು ಅವೊತ್ತೇ ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಯಾರೂ ಕೇವಲ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆಂದೇ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಮುಖ್ಯ points ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತಮ್ಮ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿಡುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇತರರು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯೋ ತಪ್ಪೋ ಎಂದು ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತೋರಿಸಬಹುದು ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರೇತರ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು 100ಕ್ಕೆ 100 ಜನ ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ಮೈಸೂರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಧ ಜನರು ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ಹೇಳುವುದರಿಂದ, ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವವರು 1½ ಭಾಗದಷ್ಟು, ಬೇಡವೆನ್ನುವರು ½ ಭಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರವೆಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು ಗಂಡೊಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಐವತ್ತು ಭಾಗ ಮದುವೆಯಾಯಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗದಂತಾಗುವುದು. ಇಂಥದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲ ಹಿಡಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಹತ್ತು-ಹದಿನೈದು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳೆಂದು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರೂ ಅವರವರ ವಾದವೇನಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಖಚಿತಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ತಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಪೂರ್ಣಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ನಿನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರು ಏನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೋ—ಅವರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ತಾವೂ ಮತ್ತು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರೂ—ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೊಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಬಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I entirely agree with Sri Veeranna Gowdh. It is no good prescribing time-limit. At this stage, it is much better you allow latitude for other speakers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members have not understood the seriousness of the problem. The Kannada speeches are to be translated into English. The whole proceedings relating to this discussion have to be corrected, edited and got printed and then sent to the Government of India by the end of this month. If there is delay in sending the proceedings, the Hon'ble Members should not blame either the Government or me.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ನಾರಾಯಣರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಯಾರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದೇ ಬೇಡ, ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಓಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಸಿ. ನಾಗಯ್ಯರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸ ಕಾದಹಾಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಯುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕಾದರೆ ಆಕಾಶವೇನೂ ಕಳಚಿ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬೀಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೆಂಟರಿನವರೂ, ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರೇನೂ ಆಕಾಶದಿಂದ ಇಳಿದುಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲ ಕಾದೇ ಕಾಯುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Anyhow it is no use discussing this problem for many more days. As one of the Hon'ble Members put it, everybody has already formed his own opinion. If they want to reply to one or two points, it may not take more than 10 or 15 minutes. The argument that is already covered need not be repeated

ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮೂವರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನು ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ಜನರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇರೆ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದುದರಿಂದ ಅಷ್ಟೇನೂ ಕಾಲ ಬೇಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೂ ಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ 10-15 ನಿಮಿಷ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಅಂತೂ ಏನೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲಪರಿಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳ ವರದಿ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಗ ಆದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ).

ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಮಾತಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವವರು 20 ಮಂದಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು, ಬೇಡ ಅನ್ನತಕ್ಕವರು 8 ಜನ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿತ್ತು. ಬಾಕಿಯುವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವೇ ಸಿಕ್ಕಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಏಕೀಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹುಮತ ಬಂದು ಪ್ರಚಾರಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಯಿತು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಆಗಬಾರದು ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಏಕೀಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೇ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಪ್ರಚಾರಹಬ್ಬಿತೋ ಈಗಲೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಆಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ತಾವು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸಮಾನಾವಕಾಶಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿರುವ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಾಂತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳೂ ತಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ತಿಂಗಳ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಕರೆದಿರುತ್ತವೆ; ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಶೇಖರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ. We have gone by default, It is much better we don't go by default.

ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳವರೂ ಹೇಗೆ ಅವರವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನಮಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ. ಈಗ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ತರಾ–ತುರಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಾದರೂ ನಾವೂ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವ ಮುನ್ನ ಅವರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಾಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೇ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನೇ ಆಗಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಹಾಗೂ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಆಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವಕಾಶವೇನೂ ನಮ್ಮ ತಲೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೀಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡಚಣೆಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಆದರೆ ತಾವು ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರೊಬ್ಬರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಯಾವ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳೂ ಬಾರದಂತೆ ತಾವೊಂದು ನಮಗೆ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವೈ. ನೀಲೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಅಥವಾ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಮೇಲಿನವರಿಗೆ ಇದರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಾರು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಶದಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅದರಂತೆಯೇ ವಿರೋಧಿಸತಕ್ಕವರೂ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೇನೇ ಅದರ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಯಾವುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಮೇಲಿನವರಿಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರ ಗಮನ ಸೆಳೆಯಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ತೂಕ ಹಾಕಲು ಅವರಿಗೊಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಫಲ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡರು ಬಾಕಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವೇ ಸಾಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಯಾರು ಕೆಲವರು ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಓದಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಂಥವರಿಗಾದರೂ ತಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ,

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಈ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳೇ ಪ್ರಭುಗಳು, ಅವರ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳೇ ಪ್ರಭುಗಳೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಈ ಪ್ರಭುಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೆದು ನಮಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಪ್ರಾಂತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಈ S.R,C. ವರದಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರು ಬರತಕ್ಕ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಈ ತಿಂಗಳಾಖೈರಿನೊಳಗಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತೆ ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರಾಂತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ತಿಂಗಳು 25ರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕರೆದಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿನವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಬೇಗ ತಿಳಿಸಿಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು, ಸಭೆ 20ಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಗಿಯಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು, ಅನುಮಾನಾಸ್ಪದವಾಗಿ ತೋರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರೇನಾದರೂ ಇಷ್ಟನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನೊಳಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದೇಶ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ತರಲಿ, ಆದರೆ ತಾವು ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನ್ನಾಡಲು ಅನೇಕ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಬಂಧಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If there is a communication from the Government of India, it is much better you disclose it to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—To-morrow it will be decided. Sri Gopala Gowda.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ–ಹೊಸನಗರ).—ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಾನು ಭಾಷಣಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುವ ಮುನ್ನ ಈಗ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಯಿತು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗಿನ್ನೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.

I would like to express my views on this particular point whether the States Reorganisation Commission's Report should be discussed thoroughly and whether all the members should be allowed to express their views or that

the time-limit must be there and it must be over within five days as we are now thinking.

ಈಗ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ವರದಿಯಮೇಲೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಖಚಿತವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಷ್ಟ ಪಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಾವು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದುದೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಕಳೆದ ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳಿನಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳು ನಡೆದಿವೆ; ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಘರ್ಷಣೆಗಳೂ, ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನಗಳೂ ನಡೆದಿವೆ. ಜನತೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಲು ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸತಕ್ಕವರ ಪೈಕಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಜನತೆಯ ಅಭಿಮತ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಪರೋಕ್ಷವಾಗಿಯಾದರೂ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು, ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಿಂದ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷ 10 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಯೆಂದು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದೆವು. ಕೆಲವರು ಐದು ದಿವಸಗಳಾದರೆ ಸಾಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾಯರು ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧನಾಗಿರ ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರಂತೆ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸ ತಕ್ಕವರು ಇನ್ನೂ ಅನೇಕರಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ವಿರೋಧಿಸತಕ್ಕವರು ಏನೇನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಂಶ ಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಾರಣ ನಾನು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಾದ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೂ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣ ಮುಗಿಸಿದ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಮುಖಗಳನ್ನೂ ನೋಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿದರು. ಯಾರೂ ಏಳುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ನಾನು ಮೆಲ್ಲನೆ ಏಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಏಕೋ ನಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗಾಬರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರಲು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಗುಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಭಾಷಣಗಳೇನೋ ಎದ್ದೂ ಬಿದ್ದೂ ಒಂದೆರಡು ದಿವಸ ಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಿನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿವ ನಂಜೇಗೌಡರು ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ನನಗೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ನಾನಂತೂ ಗಾಬರಿ ಆಗಿ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೆ. ಕಾರಣ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಕಾಲವಾದರೂ ನಡೆಯಲೇ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಯಾರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇಲಕ್ಕೆ ಏಳದೆ ಇದ್ದು ದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದೂ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗಾಬರಿ ಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನೇನೋ ಖಚಿತವಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲೇಬೇಕು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ತೋರಿಸ ಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ತೋರಬೇಕಾದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಒಂದು ಹೊಣಗಾರಿಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಿದ್ದಿದೆ. ನಾವುಗಳು ಹಾಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಗಳಿಂದ ಆರಿಸಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಾರದೆ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಯಾರೂ ಬಂದು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಪೀಡಿಸುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ನಾವು ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಿರ್ವಂಚನೆಯಾಗಿ ಯಾರ ಬಲ ವಂತಕ್ಕೂ ಅಡ್ಡಿಯಾಗದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯನವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂ ರವರೂ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನೂ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರ ರಾಯರು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಹಳ ಆಳವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೊಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಕೆಪ್ಯಾಸಿಟಿ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಒಂದು ವಿಸ್ಡಂ ಕೂಡ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಇದು ಕಹಿ ಯಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಒಂದು ವಾತಾವರಣ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆ ರೀತಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಹಿ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಹೋಗಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಉಂಟುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಹಿ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಅವರವರ ಮನ ಬಿಚ್ಚಿ ಮಾತನಾಡು ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ಹೇಳಿ ದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬಹಳ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಬಹಳ dispassionate ಆಗಿ ಯಾವ ವ್ಯಾಮೋಹಕ್ಕೂ ಒಳಗಾಗದೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have understood you. The House will now rise and meet again tomorrow at Twelve o' clock.

The House rose for the day at Five of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Friday the 18th November 1955.